

Chapter 4

List of Preparers, Consultation and Coordination

Chapter 4

List of Preparers, Consultation and Coordination

4.1 List of Preparers

Following is a list of persons who contributed to preparation of this EA/IS. This list is consistent with the requirements set forth in NEPA and CEQA (40 CFS 1502.17 and Section 15129 of the State CEQA Guidelines).

4.1.1 Bureau of Reclamation

Patricia A. Roberson Project Manager

4.1.2 San Luis & Delta-Mendota Authority

Tom Boardman Senior Engineer

4.1.3 Jones & Stokes

Name	Qualifications	Expertise	Years of Experience	Participation
Craig Stevens	B.S., Natural Resources	Regulatory compliance, NEPA/CEQA compliance, water resource planning	14	Principal in charge
Mary Lee Knecht	B.S., Environmental Science, Policy, and Management	Water resource planning, NEPA/CEQA compliance, watershed management	7	Project manager
Russ Brown	Ph.D., Civil Engineering (water resources) M.S., Ocean Engineering B.S., Civil and Environmental Engineering	Hydrologic and water quality modeling to support fisheries and other water resource investigations	23	Hydrologist and water quality specialist

Name	Qualifications	Expertise	Years of Experience	Participation
Donna Maniscalco	B.S., Wildlife, Fish & Conservation Biology	Fisheries impact assessment, fish population surveys, and fish sampling	3	Fisheries specialist
Kevin Lee	M.S., Civil and Environmental Engineering B.S., Civil Engineering	Air quality and noise science	4	Air quality and noise specialist
Gabriel Roark	B.A., Anthropology	Historical archaeology, NEPA/SEPA/CEQA compliance, and prehistoric archaeology	4	Cultural resources specialist
Warren Shaul	B.A., Biology M.S., Fisheries Biology	Fisheries biology, aquatic ecology, and marine biology	29	Sr. biologist II, fisheries
Stephanie Parsons	B.S., Biology	Wildlife biology, regulatory compliance, construction monitoring	5	Vegetation and wildlife specialist
Stephanie Bradley	B.S., Environmental Biology & Management	CEQA and NEPA document coordination	2	Environmental specialist
Darle Tilly	A.B., English Literature	Technical editing	20	Technical writer and editor
Carol-Anne Hicks	B.S., Environmental and Resource Sciences	Publications specialist	2	Document coordination and publication

4.1.4 CH2M Hill

Armin Munévar

Work on CALSIM II Model

4.2 Consultation and Coordination

During preparation of this draft EA/IS, the lead agencies, Reclamation and the Authority, consulted with resource specialists, agencies with specific expertise in project issues, and members of the public. These consultations assisted the lead agencies in determining the scope of this document, clarifying the description of the Proposed Action, and identifying the environmental and mitigation measures. Consultation included interagency communications and meetings. The lead agencies will continue to solicit public and agency input on the Proposed Action by encouraging review of this EA/IS.

As previously mentioned, this EA/IS has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA, as amended (42 USC 4321 *et seq.*). Reclamation is also complying with other applicable laws, including the following:

Clean Air Act of 1972, as amended (42 USC 7401 *et seq.*). Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act prohibits federal action or support of activities that do not conform to a State Implementation Plan. The Proposed Action is not expected to violate any standard, increase violations in the project area, exceed the EPA's general conformity *de minimis* threshold, or hinder the attainment of air quality objectives in the local air basin.

Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended (33 USC 1251 *et seq.*). The Proposed Action is in compliance with Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. The Proposed Action would not result in placement of fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands.

Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 USC 1531 *et seq.*). Reclamation has determined that the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect any listed terrestrial species. Reclamation is requesting concurrence from USFWS. Effects to the aquatic environment are being addressed through the OCAP consultation.

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958, as amended (16 USC 661 *et seq.*). Coordination with the USFWS under this act has been integrated throughout the preparation of the EA/IS. USFWS staff participated in the original project discussions (Value Planning workshop), attended site visits with Reclamation staff, and provided a Planning Aid Memo in February 2003. The USFWS is also preparing a Coordination Act Report for this project.

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 USC 4321 *et seq.*). This EA/IS was prepared pursuant to and in accordance with NEPA and CEQ on implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508).

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470). It has been determined that the Proposed Action would have no adverse effect on historic properties under Section 106 of the NHPA. Reclamation will comply with Section 106 of the NHPA and implementing regulations of 36 CFR 800 and will consult with the SHPO regarding this determination.

Farmlands Protection Policy Act. The purpose of the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) is to minimize the extent to which federal programs contribute to the unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. FPPA ensures, to the maximum extent practicable, that federal programs are administered in a manner that is compatible with state, unit of local government, and private programs to protect farmland. The proposed action will not contribute to the unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

4.2.1 Future Consultation and Coordination

Additional consultation and coordination would need to be conducted with various agencies in the future if Reclamation wished to pursue additional pumping at the Tracy Pumping Plant. As mentioned in Chapter 2, additional pipes are included in the Intertie project design to accommodate reverse flow capability. The additional pipes would be designed with the potential to add pumps at a future date to provide additional pumping capacity up to 900 cfs. There is no intent to install the additional pumps in the near future, and their installation would require a lengthy approval process. First, specific feasibility study authorization from Congress to pump at 5100 cfs at the Tracy Pumping Plant and improve the Delta-Mendota Canal from the Tracy Pumping Plant headworks to the Intertie would be required. The Final Feasibility Report and EIS/EIR would be submitted through the Administration to Congress. If Congressional authorization and funding were provided, Reclamation could proceed with other required actions such as advanced design and construction activities. Prior to any construction activities, Reclamation would be required to consult with the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries in compliance with the ESA. Although the review and approval process for additional pumping capacity is quite extensive, the cost of constructing a pump house that could accommodate future pumps is relatively minor compared to retrofitting a smaller pump house or building an entirely new facility in the future. For this reason, the Proposed Action incorporates a footprint that would accommodate the physical installation of additional pumps.